

Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Grason, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Jacobs, McHenry, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Gwinn, Stewart, of Balt. city, Sherwood, of Balt. city, Ware, Fiery, Davis, Kilgour, Waters, Anderson, Hollyday, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke and Shower—46.

So the Convention refused to accept the substitute.

The question then recurred on the adoption of the substitute as offered by Mr. Dorsey in place of the 5th section of said report.

On motion of Mr. Dorsey, the yeas and nays were ordered and resulted as follows:

Affirmative.—Messrs. Chambers, of Kent, Donaldson, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Davis and Waters—7.

Negative.—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Dickinson, Ricaud, Bond, Jenifer, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Welch, Chandler, Lloyd, John Dennis, Dashiell, Williams, McCullough, Miller, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Grason, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Gaither, Biser, Sappington, Stephenson, McHenry, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Gwinn, Stewart, of Balt. city, Brent, of Balt. city, Sherwood, of Balt. city, Ware, Fiery, Michael Newcomer, Kilgour, Brewer, Anderson, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Parke, Shower and Brown—57.

So the Convention refused to accept the substitute.

The question then recurred upon the adoption of the 5th section as reported by the committee.

On motion of Mr. McHenry, the yeas and nays were ordered and resulted as follows:

Affirmative.—Messrs. Chapman, Pres't, Morgan, Blakistone, Hopewell, Ricaud, Chambers, of Kent, Dorsey, Wells, Randall, Sellman, Bond, Howard, Buchanan, Bell, Chandler, Lloyd, Dickinson, John Dennis, Dashiell, Williams, Hodson, McCullough, Miller, Bowie, Tuck, Sprigg, McCubbin, Bowling, Grason, Wright, Dirickson, McMaster, Jacobs, Thomas, Shriver, Biser, Stephenson, Nelson, Carter, Thawley, Stewart, of Caroline, Stewart, of Balt. city, Ware, Fiery, Davis, Kilgour, Brewer, Waters, Anderson, Hollyday, Slicer, Fitzpatrick, Smith, Shower and Brown—55.

Negative.—Messrs. Donaldson, Jenifer, Welch, Gaither, Sappington, McHenry, Gwinn, Brent, of Balt. city, Sherwood, of Balt. city, Michael Newcomer and Parke—11.

So the 5th section was adopted.

The President laid before the Convention the following communication from His Excellency Governor Low:

STATE DEPARTMENT,
Annapolis, April 2d, 1851.

To the President of the Convention:

SIR: In compliance with the resolution of the Convention, I herewith transmit copies of the papers and documents, on file in this Department, relating to the case of the requisition of the Governor of Pennsylvania, for the delivery of J. S. Mitchell.

I have the honor to be, respectfully, &c.

E. LOUIS LOWE.

{ Which was read.

Mr. BLAKISTONE moved that the communication and accompanying papers be referred to a select committee of seven, to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLAKISTON requested the Chair, that he should not be appointed a member of the committee.

Mr. BOWIE moved to reconsider the motion to refer. He could see no reason whatever for referring a communication of this sort to a committee where it would sleep and never be heard of again. He took it for granted that the communication was intended to convey information to the people of the State in reference to a very important and delicate question—the case of a citizen of Maryland going into Pennsylvania to recapture a fugitive slave. The most proper course for the Convention to pursue would be, in his opinion, to order the publication of the message, whatever it might contain. If there was any question upon the contents of the message, members should call for the reading of the papers. The presumption was, that the action of the Governor of Maryland had been conformable to the general sentiments of the people; and he was willing, in advance, to lay it before the people. He was unwilling to place the communication in the hands of a Committee, which might never report.

Mr. JENIFER suggested that the gentleman who had introduced the resolution of inquiry, to which this was a reply, was not present, and perhaps it would be better to allow the whole subject to lie over until to-morrow morning.

Mr. BOWIE remarked that it might never come up again, if passed over now.

Mr. THOMAS suggested that the committee would probably report in the morning; and there might be portions of the document which need not be printed. He understood that there was an elaborate and voluminous indictment, which it would perhaps be unnecessary to print.

Mr. BOWIE remarked that he was anxious to see that very indictment, and to have the people see it, and know what the action of Pennsylvania has been.

Mr. THOMAS said that he did not know what the document contained. He had at first desired that it should be read, but finding that it was voluminous, he had withdrawn that request. It would be advisable that a committee should examine it this evening, as there might be other papers, even if the indictment should be published, which might advantageously be omitted.

Mr. BOWIE said that his only objection was, that by possibility, and he feared by probability, the committee would not report.

Mr. BLAKISTONE wished it to be understood that in moving its reference to a committee, he had no intention to conceal from the public the communication just received from the Executive. The papers were voluminous, and he thought it the best way to refer them to a committee, which would report to the Convention what action it was proper to take upon them, as well as what portion of them—if only a portion—should